



Take Me Fishing™ in Idaho

An Evaluation of the Idaho Department of Fish & Game's 2006 Angler Recruitment and Retention Program

Prepared for:

Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation
601 North Fairfax Street, Suite 440
Alexandria, VA 22314

and

Idaho Department of Fish & Game
600 South Walnut
Boise, ID 83712

Prepared by:

Dr. Tony Fedler
Human Dimensions Consulting
9707 SW 5th Road
Gainesville, FL 32608

April 2007

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the second year (2006) of a pilot project between the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) to assess the benefits of an integrated awareness and grassroots education program to increase recruitment and retention (R&R) of resident license buyers in Idaho. The first year (2005) project focused on increasing resident fishing license sales in the Panhandle and Southwest regions of the state. While the response to the advertising and direct mail activities differed by target group and region, overall renewal rates for the target groups averaged seven percentage points greater than the control groups.

The 2005 R&R program was expanded in 2006 to include the Southeast and Upper Snake regions in addition to the Panhandle and Southwest regions. The target audience in the Panhandle and Southwest regions was also increased in size. The remaining three regions, Clearwater, Magic Valley and Salmon, were used as a control to assess the effects of the R&R program since they were not involved in any of the advertising or direct mail activities.

The focus of the 2006 R&R program was on three groups, which were identified using data from the IDFG license database. These groups were:

Group A – men, aged 25-54, who bought a license in 2004, and 2002 and/or 2003, but not 2005.

Group B – men, aged 25-54, who bought two licenses between 1998 and 2003, but not 2004 or 2005.

2005 Recruits – men, aged 25-54, who bought a license in 2005, but not during the 1998 to 2004 period.

Objectives for increases in license sales due to the R&R program were two percentage points greater in each target region than the control region for Group A and Group B, and three percentage points greater for renewals by 2005 Recruits. The R&R program employed a variety of strategies including: direct mail, television programming and advertising, radio advertisements, print media stories, department website enhancements, and improved signage at license vendors. Elements of the program occurred during May and June in 2006 throughout each of the four regions.

Direct mail postcards with the *Take Me Fishing*[™] imagery and messages were sent to a target sample in each of the three groups. The remaining group members not receiving the direct mail were used as a control to determine the effects of the direct mail on license sales in the four regions.

The 2006 R&R program should be viewed as a success for several reasons. First, the program resulted in increased license sales. An additional 2,021 licenses were sold as a result of the R&R program. The license revenue generated by these sales was \$76,050 based on the resident license price of \$25 and a Sport Fish Restoration apportionment of \$12.63 per license sold. The cost of the R&R advertising and direct mail activities was \$42,917, which resulted in a net benefit of \$1.77 for each dollar spent on the program.

It is important to note that the increased license sales associated with the R&R program occurred during the January through July period when license sales were declining statewide. Thus, the program mitigated the effects of these declines to some degree in each of the four regions.

Overall, license sales averaged about one percentage point higher in the target regions than in the control regions across all three groups for anglers exposed to advertising only. When the three groups were exposed to the advertising and received the direct mail postcard, sales rose by 2.8 percentage points over the control regions. However, angler response to the advertising and direct mail activities differed by region and group. Recently lapsed anglers in Group A responded by an average 6.5 percentage points to the advertising and direct mail combined, but poorly to advertising alone. Their average increase for those anglers exposed to the advertising and receiving the direct mail ranged from 6.1 to 7.2 percentage points greater than the control region. This group of recently lapsed anglers should be the focus of future efforts because the benefits were much greater than the other two groups. Further analysis of license purchases by this group, focusing on age and purchase history, may result in refinements that yield greater efficiency and improved results.

The longer-term lapsed anglers in Group B generally responded poorly in the Panhandle and Southwest regions and slightly better in the Southeast and Upper Snake regions. Overall, sales increases for this group were less than one percentage point greater than the control regions for those exposed to advertising only and 2.2 percentage points for advertising and direct mail. Thus, a different program strategy may be needed for this group to become active license buyers again.

The R&R program had mixed results among the 2005 Recruits. Overall, this group showed a very low response to advertising only (0.8 percentage point increase) and a 2.7 percentage point increase to advertising and direct mail. There was virtually no response to the program by this group in the Panhandle region and only a slight response to the advertising and direct mail in the Southwest region. The response to the R&R program by 2005 Recruits was slightly better in the Southeast region (4.5 percentage points) where advertising alone played the most important role in increasing license sales. Advertising and direct mail combined had the greatest influence on license sales in the Upper Snake region (6.7 percentage points). Both advertising and direct mail played a role in increasing license sales by this group. Since this was the first time 2005 Recruits were included as a target, additional research into the motivations and constraints associated with this group is warranted to better understand and effectively reach and retain new recruits.

The focus of the R&R program on providing information on local family fishing opportunities continues to be a strong strategy. The importance of fishing with family and friends and having quality local fishing locations nearby were clearly apparent from the mail survey data. The only addition to these messages might be to further reinforce the benefits of family fishing and urge lapsed anglers to set aside time in the outdoors for fishing. Designing effective strategies for addressing the perceived constraint of time should be given careful deliberation.

An analysis of license sales at the end of the year is needed. Because of the statewide decline in sales through July of 2006 and the extended spring runoff in 2006, further analysis is warranted to help clarify 2006 license sales. The late spring runoff may have caused a delay in license purchases until late in the summer rather than a drop in overall sales. If the decline persisted through the end of the year, then some other factors may have been at work, such as high gas prices or the increase in the cost of a license. This analysis will provide important information for understanding 2006 sales overall as well as provide additional perspective to the R&R program.

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	ii
List of Tables.....	vi
Introduction	1
Target Audience.....	1
Project Objectives.....	2
2006 Recruitment and Retention Program.....	2
Methods and Procedures	4
Results	5
License Sales.....	5
License Purchasing Groups.....	5
Effects of Recruitment and Retention Program.....	7
Direct Mail Survey.....	9
Analysis of 2006 Objectives.....	17
2006 Recruitment and Retention Program Benefits.....	18
Conclusions	20
Recommendations and Next Steps.....	21
Appendix A: Direct Mail Survey Questionnaire.....	23

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Resident license sales and year to year percent change: January – July of 2002 – 2006.....	6
Table 2: 2006 license purchases for component groups by selected regions.....	6
Table 3: Effect of advertising and direct mail on license sales: May 16 through July 31.....	8
Table 4: Which of the following outdoor activities do you regularly participate in, and of these, which do your family and friends enjoy?.....	10
Table 5: In which of the past years have you gone fishing in Idaho?.....	10
Table 6: If you haven't gone fishing yet in 2006, how likely is it that you go fishing during 2006?.....	10
Table 7: How many years have you been fishing in Idaho?	11
Table 8: Please rate each of the factors listed below as to how important they are to your enjoyment of fishing.....	11
Table 9: How important are each of the following in preventing you from fishing or going fishing more often?.....	12
Table 10: During the past two months did you notice any advertising specifically promoting fishing?	13
Table 11: Did you see any fishing advertising that includes scenes of two people with one person asking to "take me fishing"?.....	13
Table 12: Do you recall seeing or hearing about any of the following items in the past two months?.....	13
Table 13: Did you notice or use any of the following items?.....	14
Table 14: Which of the following would help you to go fishing or go fishing more often?.....	14
Table 15: Do you recall receiving a postcard that had a picture of a young girl and her father fishing?.....	15

List of Tables - Continued

	Page
Table 16: Did this postcard reminder influence you to buy a fishing license this year?	15
Table 17: Have you seen advertisements with the above picture in any of the following places?	15
Table 18: Target group and 2006 license purchases based on survey results.....	16
Table 19: Effect of seeing general advertising and direct mail on 2006 license sales based on survey results.....	16
Table 20: Net impact of the recruitment and retention program on license sales.....	19

An Evaluation of the Idaho Department of Fish & Game's 2006 Angler Recruitment and Retention Program

Introduction

2006 was the second year of a pilot project between the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) to assess the benefits of an integrated awareness and grassroots education program to increase recruitment and retention (R&R) of resident anglers in Idaho. The 2005 R&R program focused on increasing resident fishing license sales in the Panhandle and Southwest regions of the state¹. While the response to the advertising and direct mail activities differed by target group and region, overall renewal rates for the target groups were an average of seven percentage points greater than the control groups. The program resulted in an additional 1,651 licenses being sold, which generated over \$57,000 in license fees and Sport Fish Restoration (SFR) program apportionments. These benefits were generated by less than \$20,000 in program costs.

Target Audience

The 2005 R&R program was expanded in 2006 to include four of seven state regions. The Southeast and Upper Snake regions were included as target areas in addition to the Panhandle and Southwest regions. The remaining three regions, Clearwater, Magic Valley and Salmon, were used as a control to assess the effects of the R&R program since they were not involved in any of the advertising or direct mail activities.

The focus of the 2006 R&R program was on three groups which were identified using data from the IDFG license database. These target groups were:

Group A – men, aged 25-54, who bought a license in 2004, and 2002 and/or 2003, but not 2005.

Group B – men, aged 25-54, who bought two licenses between 1998 and 2003, but not 2004 or 2005.

2005 Recruits – men, aged 25-54, who bought a license in 2005, but not during the 1998 to 2004 period.

The above three groups in each of the four regions were the targets of the R&R program conducted by the IDFG. All residents of the regions had the possibility of seeing or hearing some aspect of the campaign. Thus, the campaign also had the opportunity to effect license buying among other groups of license buyers (e.g., renewals by long-term buyers or long-term dropouts). While these other groups are important, research has shown that they may not be as responsive to an integrated R&R program as recently lapsed buyers. 2005 Recruits were added to the program in 2006 because of the response a similar group of 2004 recruits had to the 2005 program.

¹ The 2005 project report is available on www.rbff.org under Research/Program Evaluation

Project Objectives

During the planning of the 2005 R&R program, IDFG staff identified long-term and short-term license sales objectives for the Panhandle and Southwest regions. When the decision was made to add the Southeast and Upper Snake regions to the 2006 program, only short-term objectives were developed for the latter two regions.

For purposes of evaluating the R&R program, specific objectives were established that reflected the intent of the program. Development of objectives in each of the four regions was guided by the results of the 2005 R&R program. The addition of two new regions in 2006 added some uncertainty as to what the response to the 2006 program might be. It was also recognized by the project planning team that many factors outside of the R&R program, such as weather, license price changes, and the general economy can impact license sales. As a result, the same R&R program objectives were set for each of the four regions and focused on the desired impacts of the program rather than on specific license sales targets.

The regional license sales and program objectives were:

Regional long-term objectives:

Panhandle: Increase resident fishing license sales by 6,000 units over a 5-year period.

Southwest: Increase resident fishing license sales by 15,000 units over a 5-year period.

Regional short-term objectives:

Panhandle: Increase resident fishing license sales by 1,200 units during 2006.

Southwest: Increase resident fishing license sales by 3,000 units during 2006.

Southeast: Increase resident fishing license sales by 660 units during 2006.

Upper Snake: Increase resident fishing license sales by 1,170 units during 2006.

R&R program objectives:

Group A: The target regions will have a renewal rate two percentage points greater than the control region group.

Group B: The target regions will have a renewal rate two percentage points greater than the control region group.

2005 Recruits: The target regions will have a renewal rate three percentage points greater than the control region group.

2006 Recruitment and Retention Program

The IDFG's 2006 R&R program leveraged the *Take Me Fishing*TM national advertising campaign and built on the learning from the 2005 R&R program. Some of the 2006 strategies involved continuing efforts begun in 2005, including distribution of *Take Me Fishing* signage to license vendors and production of regional Family Fishing Water brochures, which incorporated *Take Me Fishing* images.

Three groups of anglers were selected in 2006 to test the effects of a combination of direct mail, television programming and advertising, radio advertisements, print media stories and advertising,

department website enhancements, and improved signage on license sales. The following schedule outlines the sequence and types of activities implemented during the program.

January:

Take Me Fishing images were incorporated into 2006 Idaho fishing regulations. The “Ashley” image was placed on the front cover of regulations. Additional images were placed inside the regulations to increase visibility of license vendors. (In 2005, *Take Me Fishing* images were incorporated into window decals and signs for distribution to license vendors. Distribution began in mid-2005 and continued throughout 2005 and 2006.) The 2006 fishing regulations also included additional information on the location of Family Fishing Waters.

May:

Idaho Fish and Game News was distributed to license vendors statewide. The publication highlighted fishing opportunities in all regions of the state, promoted Free Fishing Day and included a *Take Me Fishing* advertisement. IDFG printed and distributed 60,000 copies of *Idaho Fish and Game News*.

May:

IDFG purchased *Take Me Fishing* radio and television advertising in Idaho Falls/Pocatello market. *Take Me Fishing* spots were purchased on cable television in the Panhandle region. Advertising was placed on cable channels identified by ACORN consumer profile data.

May-August:

Take Me Fishing advertisement placed in *Wild Idaho News*, a for-profit hunting and fishing newspaper. The bi-weekly newspaper is distributed at license vendors, sports shops, restaurants, motels, businesses and other locations throughout Idaho.

May 8 – June 9:

The television series, “Hatchery to Hook” aired on local television news programs during May and early June in four out of five of Idaho’s TV markets (Idaho Falls/Pocatello, Twin Falls, Boise, and Lewiston.) The series was produced by Idaho Fish and Game and featured the department’s efforts to improve and create fishing opportunities for families. The series also profiled kids and their families fishing. All stories included anchor tags directing viewers to the Fish and Game website for additional information.

May 12:

Postcard mailed to lapsed anglers. Text on postcards directed people to Fish and Game website for more information on where to go and where to buy a license.

May 15 – May 26

148 radio spots were broadcast in the Southwest Region. Advertisements were split among radio stations with Classic Country, Talk Radio, All Sports and Classic Rock formats.

May 15 – May 27:

206 radio spots were broadcast on News, Classic Country and Country Rock stations in the Panhandle Region.

June:

Family Fishing Water brochures, featuring *Take Me Fishing* images, were distributed to license vendors throughout the state. Vendors received brochures highlighting Family Fishing Waters in their area. Vendors also provided a clear, plastic display case to show brochures and subsequent Fish and Game materials.

June 10:

Free Fishing Day. 31 events held statewide, including 13 in Southwest Region, 10 in the Panhandle, 4 in Southeast and 1 in Upper Snake Regions. Pre-event publicity consisted of news releases, broadcast interviews, columns, limited newspaper advertising and other outreach efforts.

June 21:

Second postcard mailed to lapsed anglers contacted in May.

Methods and Procedures

License buyers in each of the three groups were identified in IDFG's Panhandle, Southwest, Southeast and Upper Snake regions using the IDFG's electronic license database. A sample of buyers from each of the three groups was randomly selected and assigned to a target group that would receive two direct mail postcards. The remaining group members were assigned to a control group to aid in determining the effect of the direct mail. These control groups were exposed to the same advertising activities as the target groups but did not receive the direct mail postcards. Sample sizes for direct mail target and control groups were as follows:

Panhandle Region Group A (8,296) – 6,200 Target, 2,096 Control
Panhandle Region Group B (7,022) – 4,200 Target, 2,822 Control
Panhandle Region 2005 Recruits (7,797) – 2,000 Target, 5,797 Control

Southwest Region Group A (25,545) – 16,700 Target, 8,845 Control
Southwest Region Group B (20,831) – 12,000 Target, 8,831 Control
Southwest Region 2005 Recruits (20,246) – 4,000 Target, 16,246 Control

Southeast Region Group A (4,639) – 2,500 Target, 2,139 Control
Southeast Region Group B (3,951) – 2,000 Target, 1,951 Control
Southeast Region 2005 Recruits (3,432) – 1,160 Target, 2,272 Control

Upper Snake Region Group A (8,109) – 4,000 Target, 4,109 Control
Upper Snake Region Group B (3,951) – 2,000 Target, 1,951 Control
Upper Snake Region 2005 Recruits (6,458) – 2,500 Target, 3,958 Control

To assess the effects of the R&R program in the four targeted regions, three comparison groups of license buyers, with the same characteristics as Groups A and B and the 2005 Recruits, were formed by combining license buyers in the three remaining IDFG regions: Clearwater, Magic Valley and Salmon. License buyers in these three control regions were not subject to any of the direct mail or local advertising activities. They were exposed to the general *Take Me Fishing* advertising through the IDFG mass media news releases and other statewide outlets such as television, radio, website, and other activities. However, these regions were deemed non-treatment areas for analysis of the local advertising and direct mail activities. The sample size for each control region group was as follows:

Control Region Group A – 12,317
Control Region Group B – 9,809
Control Region 2005 Recruits – 10,847

To test for the effects of the R&R program, 2006 license purchase rates were compared among target and control groups in each region. Differences between target and control groups within a region should show the general effect of direct mail activities since the entire region was exposed to the media advertising.

Additionally, a survey was mailed to a random sample of those who received the direct mail postcards (Appendix A) to determine the percentage of direct mail recipients that recalled seeing or hearing the advertising and seeing the direct mail postcard. The survey was also used to collect information to assist in planning for future R&R activities. Surveys were sent to 1,250 individuals in each of the four target regions.

Results

License Sales

Table 1 shows resident fishing license sales by region for the 2002 through 2006 period. Since the 2006 data used to evaluate the R&R program ran through July, data for each of the years shown in Table 1 reflect this same duration. Resident license sales in six of the seven regions showed the same general pattern for sales between 2002 and 2006. A moderate decline from 2002 to 2003 was followed by successive small increases in 2004 and 2005. However, license sales dropped substantially during 2006 in most regions. The reason or reasons for the 2006 decline are unclear but may be related to the unusually high spring runoff, license price increase from the previous year, gasoline prices, or other factors.

License Purchasing Groups

Similar to the data in IDFG's 2005 R&R program, 2006 license buyers were aggregated into three categories according to their license purchasing history (Table 2). The first category listed is for 2005 buyers renewing in 2006. As shown in the table, renewals among 2005 buyers were very similar at about 60% statewide. The rate in the Panhandle, Southwest and Upper Snake Regions was slightly higher than 60%, while the Southwest Region was slightly less than the statewide rate. Because of the large number of eligible buyers, differences as small as one

Table 1: Resident license sales and year to year percent change: January – July of 2002 - 2006

Region	2002	2003	% Chg.	2004	% Chg.	2005	% Chg.	2006	% Chg.
Target Regions									
Panhandle	35,009	35,637	1.8%	36,587	2.7%	38,245	4.5%	37,384	-2.3%
Southwest	100,164	96,615	-3.5%	100,410	3.9%	102,494	2.1%	94,114	-8.2%
Southeast	20,764	19,640	-5.4%	19,972	1.7%	20,559	2.9%	20,334	-1.1%
Upper Snake	36,298	34,947	-3.7%	35,059	0.3%	36,298	3.5%	33,392	-8.0%
Control Regions									
Clearwater	22,348	22,069	-1.2%	22,427	1.6%	23,029	2.7%	21,096	-8.4%
Magic Valley	31,296	31,209	-0.3%	32,083	2.8%	32,603	1.6%	29,605	-9.2%
Salmon	3,925	3,815	-2.8%	3,980	4.3%	4,033	1.3%	3,343	-17.1%
Total	249,804	243,932	-2.4%	250,518	2.7%	257,261	2.7%	239,268	-7.0%

percentage point between regions result in statistical significance.

This was the case with 2005 Renewals where the purchase rates only differed by four percentage points across regions, but the Chi-Square (X^2) value was 353.42 which was significant at $p < .001$.

The second category in Table 2, the lapsed angler, was defined as anyone buying a resident fishing license during any of the years from 1999 to 2004 but not in 2005. This definition was consistent with the previous year's definition of anyone buying a resident fishing license during any of the years 1998 to 2003 but not 2004. On average, about 10% of the buyers in this category bought a license in 2006. However, the one percentage point difference among regions was statistically significant ($X^2=112.19$, $p < .001$).

There is a strong relationship between the number of years of license buying and the purchase rate in 2006. For example, anglers buying licenses during the immediate three preceding years

Table 2: 2006 license purchases for component groups by selected regions

Region/ Group	Total Eligible	2006 Sales	Purchase Rate	% of Sales
Statewide				
2005 Renewals	278,630	168,523	60.5%	70.4%
1999-2004 Lapsed	343,545	33,641	9.8%	14.1%
New Recruits	37,104	37,104	100.0%	15.5%
Total	659,279	239,268	36.3%	100.0%
Panhandle Region				
2005 Renewals	41,654	25,705	61.7%	68.8%
1999-2004 Lapsed	50,524	5,306	10.5%	14.2%
New Recruits	6,373	6,373	100.0%	17.0%
Total	98,551	37,384	37.9%	100.0%
Southwest Region				
2005 Renewals	111,506	65,209	58.5%	69.3%
1999-2004 Lapsed	141,685	13,652	9.6%	14.5%
New Recruits	15,253	15,253	100.0%	16.2%
Total	268,444	94,114	35.1%	100.0%
Southeast Region				
2005 Renewals	21,982	13,609	61.9%	66.9%
1999-2004 Lapsed	28,368	3,004	10.6%	14.8%
New Recruits	3,721	3,721	100.0%	18.3%
Total	54,071	20,334	37.6%	100.0%
Upper Snake Region				
2005 Renewals	39,048	24,390	62.5%	73.0%
1999-2004 Lapsed	47,796	4,796	10.0%	14.4%
New Recruits	4,206	4,206	100.0%	12.6%
Total	91,050	33,392	36.7%	100.0%

Note: Fishing license sales data for January 1 through July 31

(2003, 2004 and 2005) had a greater renewal rate than those anglers buying license in 2003 and 2005, but skipping 2004. Again there was consistency in renewal rates among the lapsed category of buyers across the target regions with only a one percentage point difference.

The final category of 2006 buyers was new recruits. These anglers had not purchased a license throughout the database years of 1998 to 2005 and, thus, were new entries into the license database in 2006. Overall, new recruits represented less than 20% of the resident license buyers in 2006. Statewide, 15.5% of all resident license buyers were new recruits. This rate differed substantially across the four target regions. The Southeast Region had the greatest percentage of new recruits (18.3%) while the Panhandle (17.0%) and Southwest (16.2%) Regions were in the middle and Upper Snake (12.6%) was last.

Effects of Recruitment and Retention Program

The purpose of the IDFG's R&R program was to determine if advertising and direct mail activities could influence 2006 resident fishing license purchasing by lapsed buyers and 2005 new recruits. Recall that lapsed buyers were aggregated into two groups based on their buying histories. Group A lapsed buyers were classified as those buying in 2002 and/or 2003, and 2004 but not 2005. Group B lapsed buyers were classified as those buying at least two licenses between 1998 and 2003, but not 2004 or 2005. The third group examined during 2006 was 2005 Recruits. These buyers had purchased a resident fishing license for the first time during 2005.

In Table 3, renewal rates are presented for the May 16 to July 31 time period during 2006 to help isolate the effects of the R&R program. The May 16 to July 31 time period is appropriate because it captures the license buying activity during the time when the advertising and direct mail activity occurred and the residual license sales that may have occurred following the main program effort. This is also consistent with the way the analysis was conducted for the 2005 R&R program.

Buyers from the three non-target regions, Clearwater, Magic Valley and Salmon, were aggregated to provide a control region to assess renewal rates in each of the four target regions. Renewal rates in the control region represent what the expected renewal rates for each target group (Group A, Group B and 2005 Recruits) might look like in the absence of advertising and direct mail activities.

Table 3 shows the renewal rates of those receiving exposure to advertising and receiving the direct mail postcards for each of the three target groups. When combining the four regions and three target groups, the overall total in Table 3 shows that the renewal rate for those anglers exposed to advertising only was only 0.9 of a percentage point higher than those not exposed to advertising in the control regions. Anglers exposed to advertising and receiving direct mail had a renewal rate 2.8 percentage points higher than the control. Because of the large number of potential buyers and 2006 buyers associated with the control and two advertising groups, the differences among the groups was highly significant from a statistical standpoint ($X^2=527.22$, $p<.001$).

Table 3: Effect of advertising and direct mail on license sales: May 16 through July 31

Target Group	No Advertising or Direct Mail			Advertising Only			Advertising and Direct Mail		
	Potential Buyers	2006 Buyers	Renewal Rate	Potential Buyers	2006 Buyers	Renewal Rate	Potential Buyers	2006 Buyers	Renewal Rate
	Control Regions			Panhandle Region			Panhandle Region		
Group A	17,516	2,075	11.8%	9,235	1,084	11.7%	2,149	409	19.0%
Group B	14,039	874	6.2%	6,772	454	6.7%	2,531	209	8.3%
2005 Recruits	11,222	2,722	24.3%	6,784	1,635	24.1%	1,351	328	24.3%
Average %			14.1%			14.2%			17.2%
	Control Regions			Southwest Region			Southwest Region		
Group A	17,516	2,075	11.8%	27,361	3,238	11.8%	5,914	1,056	17.9%
Group B	14,039	874	6.2%	18,759	1,175	6.3%	6,910	559	8.1%
2005 Recruits	11,222	2,722	24.3%	19,834	4,510	22.7%	2,762	722	26.1%
Average %			14.1%			13.4%			17.4%
	Control Regions			Southeast Region			Southeast Region		
Group A	17,516	2,075	11.8%	5,317	745	14.0%	937	176	18.8%
Group B	14,039	874	6.2%	3,772	333	8.8%	1,042	96	9.2%
2005 Recruits	11,222	2,722	24.3%	3,332	959	28.8%	1,002	263	26.2%
Average %			14.1%			17.2%			18.1%
	Control Regions			Upper Snake Region			Upper Snake Region		
Group A	17,516	2,075	11.8%	9,270	1,303	14.1%	1,435	265	18.5%
Group B	14,039	874	6.2%	6,986	507	7.3%	2,061	195	9.5%
2005 Recruits	11,222	2,722	24.3%	5,924	1,613	27.2%	1,677	518	30.9%
Average %			14.1%			16.2%			19.6%
Total Group A	70,064	8,300	11.8%	51,183	6,370	12.4%	10,435	1,906	18.3%
Total Group B	56,156	3,496	6.2%	36,289	2,469	6.8%	12,544	1,059	8.4%
Total 2005 Recruits	44,888	10,888	24.3%	35,874	8,717	24.3%	6,792	1,831	27.0%
Overall Total	42,777	5,671	13.3%	123,346	17,556	14.2%	29,771	4,796	16.1%

When combining each of the three groups across the target regions and comparing their aggregate renewal rates to their respective control groups, shown at the bottom of Table 3, we see a very consistent pattern relative to the effects of advertising and direct mail. For Group A,

Group B and 2005 Recruits, advertising alone had very little impact on renewal rates. The impact of advertising and direct mail together on Group A lapsed anglers was very significant ($X^2=198.21$, $p<.001$) over the Group A control. The 6.5 percentage point difference indicates a very strong effect. The effect of advertising and direct mail on the longer-term Group B lapsed anglers was much less pronounced than for Group A, but was significantly greater than the control group ($X^2=51.43$, $p<.001$). Among 2005 Recruits, advertising and direct mail was 2.7 percentage points greater than the control group and was again highly significant ($X^2=118.07$, $p<.001$). For all three groups the effects of advertising alone were minimal while advertising and direct mail had very significant impacts on recruitment rates. The combination of advertising and direct mail had the best effect on Group A lapsed anglers.

Advertising alone and advertising coupled with direct mail had different effects across the four regions. In the Panhandle and Southwest regions it appears that advertising alone had no impact as renewal rates were slightly above or below the same groups in the control region. The absence of an advertising effect in these two regions was consistent for Groups A and B as well as the 2005 Recruits.

There was a small, positive impact of the advertising in the Southeast and Upper Snake regions (Table 3). The effects ranged from a 1.1 percentage point difference for Upper Snake Group B anglers to a 4.5 percentage point difference for the 2005 Recruits in the Southeast.

Advertising coupled with the direct mail postcard had a much greater effect than advertising alone (Table 3). Overall, the direct mail had the greatest impact on Group A lapsed anglers in all regions with a 6.5 percentage point difference over their control region. The range for this group was 6.1 to 7.2 percentage points greater than the same Group A in the control region. The effect of the direct mail on Group B lapsed anglers was smaller than Group A in all regions. The effect ranged from 1.9 percentage points greater than the control region in the Southwest region to 3.3 percentage points greater in the Upper Snake region. Direct mail had no impact on 2005 Recruits in the Panhandle region and a very small effect in the Southwest and Southeast regions (Table 3) during the May 16 to July 31 period. Surprisingly, 2005 Recruits in the Upper Snake region responded quite well to the direct mail. Why these recruits responded better than their counterparts in other regions is uncertain.

Direct Mail Survey

The purpose of the survey was to determine the percentage of direct mail recipients that recalled seeing or hearing the advertising and seeing the direct mail postcard. Of the 5,000 surveys mailed, 624 were returned for an overall response rate of 12.5 percent. A total of 578 questionnaires were usable for analysis. Unusable questionnaires were returned with either incomplete or entirely missing information.

The first part of the survey asked respondents to indicate if they personally participated in each of five outdoor recreation activities shown in Table 4. A slight majority of recipients reported participation in boating and wildlife viewing. About 61% indicated that they hunted while 80% or more said they fished or camped. Slightly more respondents said that boating and wildlife viewing were family activities compared to personal activities. Family participation in hunting, fishing and camping all generally followed personal participation levels.

Respondents were asked to indicate which of the past six years they had gone fishing in Idaho (Table 5). By examining license database records, fishing license purchase rates were calculated for survey respondents. The percentage of respondents reporting they went fishing in any one year was relatively similar. However, the percentage buying a resident fishing license during 2006 declined the further back in time that fishing occurred. The fact that only 51% of the respondents reporting fishing during 2006 had actually bought a fishing license suggests that many anglers may be fishing without a valid license or fishing in an area or at a time (Free Fishing Day) that licenses are not required.

Table 6 is interesting from the standpoint that unless a respondent reported that their going fishing was “Extremely Likely”, there was a low probability that a fishing license was bought. Yet, even among those saying that going fishing during 2006 was extremely likely, only half had bought a license by July 31. Those with high expectations of going fishing, but not having purchased a license by July 31, may still have bought one later in the year.

Table 4: Which of the following outdoor activities do you regularly participate in, and of these, which do your family and friends enjoy?

Outdoor Activity	Personal		Family	
	n	% Participating	n	% Participating
Fishing	578	81.2	578	87.2
Camping	578	80.7	578	87.8
Hunting	578	61.4	578	67.5
Wildlife Viewing	578	54.9	578	62.7
Boating	578	50.7	578	61.2
Other	578	13.3	578	14.9

Table 5: In which of the past years have you gone fishing in Idaho?

Year Reported Fishing	Fishing During Year		Bought License in 2006*	
	n	% Yes	n	%
2001	578	58.6	578	28.1
2002	578	61.8	578	30.1
2003	578	62.8	578	30.4
2004	578	67.9	578	33.5
2005	578	70.5	578	41.4
2006	578	62.6	578	51.4

*Calculated from IDFG fishing license database through July 31

Table 6: If you haven't gone fishing yet in 2006, how likely is it that you will go fishing during 2006?

Likelihood of Going Fishing	Likelihood Rating		Bought License in 2006*	
	n	%	n	%
Not at all Likely	55	9.5	55	10.3
Slightly Likely	51	8.8	51	5.6
Somewhat Likely	56	9.8	56	20.0
Very Likely	45	7.8	45	15.6
Extremely Likely	370	64.1	370	49.4
Total	577	100.0	577	36.3

*Calculated from IDFG fishing license database through July 31

The data in Table 7 may initially seem confusing in that anglers fishing in Idaho six years or more were half as likely to buy a license in 2006 as anglers fishing one to five years. Remember that the survey included 2005 Recruits which comprise two-thirds of the anglers in the 1 - 5 years group.

Respondents were asked to rate 15 items that could be important to their enjoyment of fishing (Table 8). Ratings for these items were factor analyzed with the items falling into the three factors shown in the table. Items within each factor were arranged by mean importance scores. The three factors represent different dimensions of fishing enjoyment. The most important was the “Social-Psychological” dimension (average mean rating score = 4.25). The importance of being outdoors was not only rated the highest within this dimension but it was the highest of all 15 items. Spending time with family or friends and relaxation were also very important. While somewhat less important, experiencing solitude was moderately or very important to a large majority of respondents.

Table 7: How many years have you been fishing in Idaho?

Number of Years	Years Fishing		Bought License in 2006*	
	n	%	n	%
0	9	1.5	9	0.0
1-5	120	20.8	120	58.7
6-10	67	11.6	67	27.7
11-20	101	17.6	101	31.9
21-30	121	21.0	121	30.2
31-50	141	24.5	141	29.0
51+	17	3.0	17	33.3
Total	576	100.0	576	35.9
Mean years fishing	22.1			

*Calculated from IDFG fishing license database through July 31

Table 8: Please rate each of the factors listed below as to how important they are to your enjoyment of fishing

Factors	Importance (percent)					Mean Score	n	Overall Rank
	Not at All	Slightly	Some-what	Moder-ately	Very			
Social-Psychological								
To be outdoors	0.5	1.2	4.6	25.9	67.8	4.59	578	1
To spend time with family or friends	1.5	3.2	16.1	29.5	49.8	4.23	576	3
For relaxation	1.5	3.7	17.9	25.2	51.7	4.22	576	4
To have solitude	1.5	5.7	21.8	36.6	34.4	3.97	577	6
Facilities-Information								
Attractive, litter-free surroundings	1.0	2.2	6.9	26.1	63.8	4.50	577	2
Not having to worry about my or others' safety	3.5	4.7	22.2	28.1	41.5	4.00	576	5
Convenient locations close to home	3.7	7.6	26.2	36.3	26.2	3.74	577	7
Availability of information on fishing	6.1	15.7	32.4	26.7	19.1	3.37	575	9
Opportunities for activities other than fishing	7.1	13.5	33.7	30.2	15.5	3.33	578	11
Nearness to camping facilities	9.0	17.8	28.9	29.3	14.9	3.23	578	12
Fish-Related								
To catch fish	2.7	8.4	33.0	27.0	28.8	3.71	578	8
To catch big fish	8.1	15.1	30.1	27.4	19.3	3.35	577	10
To keep some fish to eat	13.2	17.4	26.7	21.5	21.3	3.20	578	13
To catch native or wild fish	10.0	17.2	36.0	20.1	16.7	3.16	576	14
To catch a lot of fish	15.0	21.9	34.7	15.7	12.7	2.89	576	15

Note: Means are calculated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 - Not at all important to 5 - Very important

The Facilities and Information dimension was next in overall importance (average mean rating score = 3.70) to respondents. Being in an attractive, litter-free environment was highly important to 90% of the respondents, while safety and convenient local fishing locations were also very important. The remaining items in this dimension: availability of fishing information, alternative activities and nearby camping facilities, were all moderately important to a majority of respondents.

The Fish-Related dimension overall was lower in importance (average mean rating score = 3.26) than the other two dimensions. Within this dimension, catching fish was the only item rated moderately or very important by a majority of respondents. Catching big or wild native fish and keeping fish to eat were rated only somewhat important on average. Catching a lot of fish was moderately or very important to less than one-third of the respondents.

The importance of the constraints to fishing shown in Table 9 supports findings from previous studies. Work and family commitments continue to be the biggest obstacle to fishing. Allocating and prioritizing work and leisure time away from fishing continues to be the chief impediment to increasing fishing participation. Noteworthy is the emergence of the price of a fishing license as a constraint. In most previous studies of fishing constraints, the price of a fishing license is usually at the bottom of the list in importance. The recent increase in the cost of a resident fishing license in Idaho may have sensitized respondents to this issue. The desire to spend time on other leisure activities, the high cost of traveling to desirable fishing locations and the absence of local fishing opportunities all were moderately or very important for about a quarter of the respondents. Of particular interest are the low ratings for not knowing where or how to fish or that fishing regulations are too complicated.

Table 9: How important are each of the following in preventing you from fishing or fishing more often?

Constraints	Importance (percent)					Mean	n
	Not at All	Slightly	Some-what	Moder-ately	Very		
Work commitments	5.6	3.4	21.3	36.2	33.5	3.89	578
Family commitments	6.1	7.4	25.7	24.3	36.5	3.78	576
Others using the water interfere with fishing	14.5	27.5	27.9	19.4	10.8	2.85	575
The price of a fishing license is too high	23.3	23.8	25.8	13.5	13.5	2.70	578
Rather spend time on other leisure activities	15.0	28.6	36.7	15.0	4.7	2.66	577
The cost of traveling to fishing areas is too high	26.8	20.4	25.6	15.7	11.5	2.65	577
Nowhere nearby to fish	26.6	22.2	26.4	14.3	10.6	2.60	577
No one to go fishing with	35.6	23.0	26.7	9.1	5.7	2.26	574
The fishing regulations are too complicated	39.8	20.7	22.7	10.2	6.6	2.23	574
Don't know <i>where</i> to fish	54.4	14.7	19.4	5.6	5.9	1.94	576
Just not interested in fishing	70.0	14.7	8.4	3.7	3.2	1.55	576
Don't know <i>how</i> to fish	73.7	13.3	8.1	2.5	2.5	1.47	578
I have had a bad fishing experience in the past	72.2	17.7	7.4	1.7	1.0	1.42	575

Note: Means are calculated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 - Not at all important to 5 - Very important

When Tables 8 and 9 are considered together, the IDFG’s current focus on creating family friendly fishing opportunities close to home appears to be a sound strategy for encouraging lapsed anglers to renew their interest in fishing. Messages focusing on re-prioritizing family time to include the benefits derived from fishing may also be productive.

The next series of questions in the survey focused on recall of the various advertising and direct mail activities. The first question asked respondents if they recalled seeing any advertising specifically promoting fishing. As shown in Table 10, about 40% reported not seeing or hearing any fishing specific advertising. Of those recalling the advertising, less than one-fifth reported magazines or radio as the source, while 38% saw television ads. Surprisingly, only 25% recalled receiving advertising through the mail. When asked specifically if respondents recalled receiving the direct mail postcard, with images of the postcard included on the questionnaire, 49% indicated they recalled it (Table 15). Apparently, most respondents did not consider the direct mail postcards sent by the IDFG as advertising. While television was the most frequently mentioned source of fishing advertising, the question needed a further breakdown to be helpful in understanding whether respondents were recalling the IDFG ads or others with fishing messages. Some of this advertising may have been from the RBBF’s national advertising campaign featuring the *Take Me Fishing* imagery and messages.

Table 10: During the past two months did you notice any advertising specifically promoting fishing?

Advertising Noticed	%	
	n	Yes
Did not notice any advertising	578	41.9
Yes, in magazines	578	16.4
Yes, on radio	578	17.6
Yes, on television	578	38.1
Yes, on things I received in the mail	578	25.5

Slightly more than half of those who reported seeing the advertising recalled seeing the *Take Me Fishing* imagery and messages (Table 11). Further, respondents recalling the *Take Me Fishing* advertising were specifically asked if they saw any of the IDFG materials used in the program. As seen in Table 12, three-fourths of the respondents recalled receiving the direct mail postcard. The remaining materials were seen by less than one-fourth of the respondents recalling advertising. It needs to be pointed out that the Family Fishing Waters brochure was not mailed out as anticipated by the IDFG. Instead, it was distributed through license vendors in the four regions. Thus, the responses to this question likely do not reflect the true awareness of the brochure since it stipulated “mailed to your home.” It is also important to note that most respondents recalled at least one of the IDFG’s materials as only 16% indicated they saw none of the materials.

Table 11: Did you see fishing advertising that includes scenes of two people with one person asking to "take me fishing"?

Saw Take Me Fishing Ad	n	%
No	157	46.9
Yes	178	53.1
Total	335	100.0

Table 12: Do you recall seeing or hearing about any of the following items in the past two months?

Items Seen or Heard	Recall of Advertising	
	n	% Yes
I did not hear about or see any of these	178	16.3
Family Fishing Waters brochure mailed to your home	178	19.2
"Take Me Fishing" postcard mailed to your home	178	76.2
Fishing information on IDFG's website	178	21.1
"How-to" of Where-to" information in IDFG publications	178	11.6

To assess penetration among all respondents, survey respondents were asked if they noticed or used any of the IDFG information sources used throughout the program. Table 13 shows the six items used in departmental publications, advertising and website pages. Slightly more than one-third of the survey respondents indicated they had not seen any of the materials or advertising. The most noticed items were messages concerning various license buying options (28%). About one-fifth of the respondents said they saw information on fishing locations and amenities or visited the IDFG website. The remaining three items were seen by 12% or fewer of the respondents.

Table 13: Did you notice or use any of the following items?

Items Seen or Used	n	% Yes
I did not notice or use any of the items	576	37.7
Various license purchasing options including web site, telephone, or retailer	576	28.2
Local information on fishing locations and amenities	576	21.5
Visiting the Department of Fish & Game's web site for more fishing information	576	18.9
Idaho Fish and Game News	576	12.6
Television stories on Idaho fishing opportunities	576	10.7
Tips and ideas to make fishing easier and improve family fishing	576	9.2

Of particular importance to future R&R efforts was the question concerning which of a variety of programs, listed in Table 14, would encourage greater fishing participation. The most frequent responses again centered on information on local fishing locations and making family fishing easier. A discount card for fishing equipment at local businesses was viewed favorably by slightly less than one-third of the respondents. The remaining three items (retailer coupon for merchandise, license purchasing options, and IDFG website information) received relatively low support.

Table 14: Which of the following would help you to go fishing or go fishing more often?

Items Supporting Participation	n	% Yes
Local information on fishing locations and amenities	576	41.3
Tips and ideas to make fishing easier for you and/or your family	576	37.2
None of the above	576	34.8
Discount card for sporting goods stores with a percentage off fishing equipment	576	30.5
Coupon for a lure or other item when you purchase a license from a local retailer	576	22.5
Various license purchasing options such as web site, telephone, and retail locations	576	17.9
Special information on the IDFG web site (fishandgame.idaho.gov)	576	15.9

When asked specifically if respondents recalled receiving the direct mail postcard (an image of the postcard was included on the questionnaire), 49% indicated they recalled it (Table 15). Further probing of those recalling the postcard found 16% indicating it influenced their decision to buy a fishing license (Table 16).

Table 15: Do you recall receiving a postcard, with the image above, that had a picture of a young girl and her father fishing?

Recalled Postcard	n	%
Yes	280	48.7
No	295	51.3
Total	575	100.0

Table 16: Did this postcard reminder influence you to buy a fishing license this year?

Influence of Postcard	n	%
Yes	43	15.6
No	233	84.4
Total	276	100.0

Respondents were also asked if they had seen the postcard image (included in the questionnaire) in any of seven locations where it had been displayed during the program (Table 17). About 58% indicated they had seen the image. The image was most frequently seen on television or in newspapers/magazines/publications. A few respondents saw the image at IDFG license vendors and in the Fish and Game regulation booklet. The image displayed in the Fish & Game News and department brochures as well as at department offices generally went unnoticed. Again, the high incidence of television likely is a blend of the recall related to the RBFF's national advertising campaign and the IDFG's program.

Table 17: Have you seen advertisements with the above picture in any of the following places?

Location of Advertising	n	% Yes
I have not seen this image before	575	42.1
On television	575	25.0
In newspapers, magazines, publications	575	20.7
At fishing license vendors	575	16.1
In the Fish & Game Regulation booklet	575	14.7
In the Fish & Game News	575	6.0
In Fish & Game informational brochures	575	5.0
At Fish & Game Department offices	575	4.3

Comparing renewal rates of survey respondents and actual license purchases helped determine the effect of the advertising and direct mail postcard on the three target groups. The 2006 renewal rates of survey respondents falling into each of the three groups were analyzed. As shown in Table 18, renewal rates by survey respondents in Group A and Group B lapsed buyers were generally consistent with the actual rates shown in Table 3 where Group A was about 19% and Group B was around 9%. However, the renewal rate in Table 18 by 2005 Recruits was nearly double the actual average across regions shown in Table 3. The reason for this dramatic difference is not apparent, but may be related to differences in the characteristics of the survey respondent sample and overall group of 2005 Recruits. Differences in purchase rates by the three groups in Table 18 were highly significant ($X^2=103.67$, $p<.001$).

Table 18: Target group and 2006 license purchases based on survey results

Target Group	Number in Group	% Buying in 2006*
Group A	289	22.9
Group B	94	7.5
2005 Recruits	195	68.8
Total	578	35.9

*Calculated from IDFG fishing license database through July 31

To further determine the relative effect of the advertising and direct mail postcard, survey respondents were classified into four groups based on responses to questions asking if they had seen any of the IDFG advertising or recalled receiving the direct mail postcard. The 2006 license renewal rates for each category are shown for each of the three target groups in Table 19. Based on the survey results, there was little difference in the renewal rates by those who recalled seeing both the direct mail and advertising and those who recalled seeing advertising only for all three groups. Alternately, there was little difference in renewal rates between those that recalled the direct mail postcard and respondents not recalling either direct mail only or direct mail and advertising. In Table 19, there appears to be little effect from the direct mail in isolation. This may be an artifact of the questions used to create the advertising and direct mail categories or the group of respondents completing the survey. Within each of the three target groups, differences in license buying rates for each of the advertising and direct mail combinations were statistically significant (Group A: $X^2=8.65$, $p=.039$; Group B: $X^2=7.44$, $p=.047$; 2005 Recruits: $X^2=8.84$, $p=.037$).

Table 19: Effect of seeing general advertising and direct mail on 2006 license sales based on survey results

Advertising Seen by Group	n	% Buying in 2006*
Group A		
Ads & Direct Mail	57	27.5
Ads Only, No Direct Mail	74	30.8
No Ads, Direct Mail Only	88	19.4
No Ads, No Direct Mail	70	16.3
Group B		
Ads & Direct Mail	14	10.0
Ads Only, No Direct Mail	24	17.6
No Ads, Direct Mail Only	37	3.8
No Ads, No Direct Mail	20	0.0
2005 Recruits		
Ads & Direct Mail	68	77.1
Ads Only, No Direct Mail	45	75.0
No Ads, Direct Mail Only	32	50.0
No Ads, No Direct Mail	48	64.7

*Calculated from IDFG fishing license database through July 31

It is very clear that seeing the advertising only or the advertising and direct mail had an impact on license purchases. The differences in renewal rates by those who did not recall seeing advertising or the direct mail and those who recalled seeing the advertising only or the advertising and direct mail were much larger than those seen in Table 3. This is likely due to the direct questioning and visual prompt used for the advertising in the questionnaire. Somewhat at odds with the data in Table 3 is the response to the advertising and advertising and direct mail by the 2005 Recruits.

There are always some inconsistencies when comparing the results of research using different methods, samples and variables that are constructed differently. This was the case

when comparing the mail survey results to the analysis using the license database. In the case of the license database, all individuals within the four regions had the possibility of seeing or hearing one or more of the program activities. However, individuals in the target regions may or may not have seen or heard any of the advertising. Direct mail recipients would be much more apt to see the direct mail since the two postcards were mailed directly to their household. Mail survey respondents are different from the aggregate regional groups in several ways. First, all individuals receive two direct mail postcards. Most respondents recalled seeing them and thus were sensitized to at least the postcard, if not other fishing-related advertising. Second, a visual prompt was shown in the mail survey and very likely affected the responses compared to an unaided response to the same question. Third, only 12% of the survey recipients returned their surveys. Survey respondents typically differ from non-respondents by being more interested in the topic of the survey and they also tend to be older. Thus, they are more apt to be aware of the program's activities than the overall group of lapsed anglers and 2005 Recruits. Finally, the relatively small mail survey sample sizes for each of the three target groups urges some caution in interpreting the results. This is not a major concern with the mail survey where differences of 10 percentage points or more are statistically different, but it should be recognized as a limitation of the data. These factors may account for some of the differences between the database and mail survey responses. However, when the results from both methods are considered together, it is clear that advertising and direct mail both are important factors influencing license purchases.

Analysis of 2006 Objectives

Because the focus of this evaluation was on the effects of the advertising and direct mail activities during the months of May and June, it did not consider resident license sales beyond July 31. As a result, we were not able to directly address the long-term and short-term objectives IDFG has set for resident license sales in the four target regions during 2006. To do so would require analysis of license sales through December.

However, based on the data in Table 1, an increase in resident license sales during 2006 does not look promising. License sales in each of the six regions through July were down over the corresponding period during 2005. Whether or not this trend continues throughout the remaining months should be examined at the end of the year.

Objectives for increases in license sales due to the R&R program were two percentage points greater in each target region than the control region for Group A and Group B, and three percentage points greater for renewals by 2005 Recruits. Data to assess the achievement of each objective can be found in Table 3. For Group A lapsed anglers, the two percentage point difference in renewal rates was achieved only in the Southeast and Upper Snake regions for those exposed to advertising only. When considering advertising and direct mail activities collectively, the objective was exceeded in all four regions. The difference averaged 6.7 percentage points.

When advertising alone was examined for Group B lapsed anglers, the two percentage point objective was achieved only in the Southeast region. However, with the addition of direct mail to the advertising, the objective was exceeded in the Panhandle, Southeast and Upper Snake regions. The average difference for Group B anglers between target and control regions was 2.8

percentage points. In the Southwest region, the difference was 1.9 percentage points, just slightly below the target.

The three percentage point difference for the 2005 Recruits was achieved in one region when only advertising was considered. A 3.5 percentage point difference was found for the Southeast region. However, the Upper Snake region nearly met the objective with a 2.9 percentage point difference. The combination of advertising and direct mail resulted in the objective for 2005 Recruits being achieved in the Upper Snake region only. The difference there was 6.6 percentage points, which was similar to the results achieved for Group A.

The effects of the R&R program were comparatively small overall because the greatest results occurred with those anglers exposed to both advertising and direct mail. The number of anglers receiving the direct mail in each of the three groups was a fraction of the total group size. The success of the advertising and direct mail combination with the Group A lapsed anglers is very encouraging.

2006 Recruitment & Retention Program Benefits

Table 20 presents the data to estimate the benefits of the 2006 R&R program in terms of net license revenues and SFR apportionments. Additionally, return on investment (ROI) can be calculated based on the overall program costs. To estimate the benefits of the R&R program, the data in Table 20, derived from data contained in Table 3, is used.

To estimate the impact of the program on license sales in the four target regions, the difference in renewal rates between the control group and advertising only group, and control group and advertising and direct mail group were calculated (Table 20). These rates are shown in the "Difference from Control" column. If these differences were zero or negative, we assumed the impact of advertising only or advertising and direct mail was zero. If the difference was greater than zero, the impact was considered to be positive.

The positive percentages for each group within each region were multiplied by the "Potential Buyers" for that group. The results for all three groups within each region were then summed for a total number of new buyers attributable to the R&R program. Nearly half of the additional licenses were sold to individuals in Group A. A total of 2,021 new licenses were sold because of the R&R program. This represents resident fishing licenses sold that otherwise would not have been purchased.

The next step in estimating the benefits of the program was to calculate the value of the net sales to the IDFG in terms of license revenue. The revenue generated to the IDFG by a resident fishing license is \$25.00. Therefore, the 2,021 licenses represent \$50,525 in new license revenue to the IDFG.

Table 20: Net impact of the recruitment and retention program on license sales

	Advertising Only			Advertising & Direct Mail		
	Potential Buyers	Difference From Control	Net Sales	Potential Buyers	Difference From Control	Net Sales
Panhandle						
Group A	9,235	0.0%	0	2,149	7.2%	155
Group B	6,772	0.5%	34	2,531	2.1%	53
2005 Recruits	6,784	0.0%	0	1,351	0.0%	0
			34			208
Southwest						
Group A	27,361	0.0%	0	5,914	6.1%	361
Group B	18,759	0.1%	19	6,910	1.9%	131
2005 Recruits	19,834	0.0%	0	2,762	1.8%	50
			19			542
Southeast						
Group A	5,317	2.2%	117	937	7.0%	66
Group B	3,772	2.6%	98	1,042	3.0%	31
2005 Recruits	3,332	4.5%	150	1,002	1.9%	19
			365			116
Upper Snake						
Group A	9,270	2.3%	213	1,435	6.7%	96
Group B	6,986	1.1%	77	2,061	3.3%	68
2005 Recruits	5,924	2.9%	172	1,677	6.6%	111
			462			275
Total			880			1,141

The second component of benefits consists of an increase in Idaho's apportionment from the SFR fund. However, this benefit will not be received by the IDFG until 2008. The reason for this delayed benefit is that 2006 license sales will become part of the formula for calculating 2008 SFR apportionments to states. This lag results from the reporting of full-year license sales to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the sales certification process used by the Service. Thus, the SFR apportionment benefits received in 2008 should be counted as a benefit for the 2006 program since that was when they were initially generated.

For Idaho, this amounts to \$12.63 per license in Federal Aid matching funds for each license sold. So, the estimated SFR revenue generated by the R&R program would be \$25,525. The total economic benefits derived from the R&R program are determined by adding license sales and SFR revenues. These combined benefits totaled \$76,050.

To estimate ROI, the total program benefits of \$76,050 were divided by the costs of the R&R program, which were \$42,917. Dividing total benefits by costs results in an ROI of 1.77:1. That is, for every dollar invested in the R&R program, \$1.77 was generated.

Conclusions

The 2006 R&R program should be viewed as a success for several reasons. First, the increased resident fishing license sales associated with the R&R program occurred during the January through July period when license sales were declining statewide. From the analysis of 2006 resident fishing license sales, advertising coupled with the direct mail postcards were the most effective overall. Anglers in the target regions purchased licenses at a rate nearly three percentage points greater than similar anglers in the control region. The greatest effect of the R&R program was seen among the recently lapsed Group A anglers. The overall effects of the program with the longer-term Group B lapsed anglers and 2005 Recruits were relatively low by comparison, but still contributed to the success of the project. Moreover, the program did mitigate the effects of declining sales in the target regions to some degree during the first seven months of the year.

The overall license sales impact exceeded the cost of the program. The overall return on investment was very positive at 1.77:1. Benefits occurred in all four regions. However, these impacts were generated by different aspects of the program in different regions. In the Panhandle and Southwest regions, advertising activities appeared to play a minor role compared to direct mail. In the Southeast and Upper Snake regions, the advertising program and direct mail both contributed to increased license sales. This finding underscores the need for both advertising and direct mail in the R&R program.

All three target groups responded to some aspect of the program, albeit inconsistently across the regions. The recent lapsed anglers in Group A responded much better than the other two groups in all regions. This group of lapsed anglers should be the focus of future efforts because the benefits were much greater. Overall, advertising and direct mail results averaged 6.5 percentage points greater in the target regions than in the control regions. This effect was consistent across all four target regions as the impacts ranged from 6.1 to 7.2 percentage points. Further analysis of license purchases by this group, focusing on age and purchase history, may result in refinements that yield greater efficiency and improved results in the future.

The longer-term lapsed anglers in Group B generally responded poorly in the Panhandle and Southwest regions but slightly better in the Southeast and Upper Snake regions. These effects ranged from 1.9 to 3.3 percentage points across the four regions. The comparative low effect (2.2 percentage points) of the R&R program with this group suggests that a different program strategy may be needed to motivate longer-term lapsed anglers to become active license buyers again.

The R&R program had mixed results among the 2005 Recruits. There was virtually no response to the program by this group in the Panhandle region and only a slight response to the advertising and direct mail in the Southwest region. The response to the R&R program by 2005 Recruits was slightly better in the Southeast region where advertising only played the most important role in increasing license sales. Advertising and direct mail combined had the greatest influence on license sales in the Upper Snake region (6.7 percentage points). Both advertising and direct mail played a role in increasing license sales by this group. Why the program was

more effective with Upper Snake 2005 Recruits than those in the other regions is unknown. It may be related to fishing opportunities, fisheries resources, water levels, or a variety of other factors. Since this was the first time 2005 Recruits were included as a target, additional research into the motivations and constraints associated with this group is warranted to better understand and effectively reach and retain new recruits.

The mail survey results generally supported those of the license sales database analysis. Because the mail sample was a subset of anglers in Groups A and B and 2005 Recruits, the mail survey results are not directly comparable to the overall license buying groups. However, it is clear that the survey respondents were aware of the advertising and direct mail activities. The limitations of sample size restricted the depth of the analysis of the mail survey data, but the results showed that overall recall of advertising was related to increased sales.

The focus of the R&R program on providing information on local family fishing opportunities continues to be a strong strategy. The importance of fishing with family and friends and having quality fishing locations nearby were clearly apparent from the mail survey data. The only addition to these messages might be to further reinforce the benefits of family fishing and urge lapsed anglers to set aside time in the outdoors for fishing. Designing effective strategies for addressing the perceived constraint of time should be given careful deliberation.

An analysis of license sales at the end of the year is clearly needed. Because of the statewide decline in sales through July of 2006 and the extended spring runoff in 2006, further analysis is warranted to help clarify 2006 license sales. The late spring runoff may have caused a delay in license purchases until later in the summer rather than a drop in overall sales. If the decline persisted through the end of the year, then some other factors may have been at work, such as high gas prices or the increase in the cost of a license. This analysis will provide important information for analyzing 2006 sales overall as well as contribute additional perspective to the R&R program.

Recommendations and Next Steps

- ◆ A complete analysis of license sales for the entire 2006 year should be undertaken to determine if sales declines continued through the August – December period. Also, any further residual effects of the R&R program could be identified.
- ◆ Future R&R program target groups should, at least in part, include Group A and a group similar to the 2005 Recruits. Additional research on new recruits would be helpful in better understanding this group and help define relevant messages.
- ◆ The program should also be executed with low license sales impact activities eliminated and additional activities developed to address the needs of new recruits.
- ◆ The use of direct mail to communicate with recently lapsed anglers should continue and be expanded with those groups and subgroups that responded favorably.
- ◆ Further study of the relatively poor response to the R&R program in the Southwest region should be initiated. This region has the largest number of both active and lapsed anglers in the state, the best range of communication options, and access to a wide range of fishing opportunities, yet they responded to the program at a level below other regions.

- ◆ Designing effective strategies for addressing the perceived constraint of time should be given careful deliberation.
- ◆ Further analysis of license purchases by Group A, focusing on age and purchase history, may result in refinements that yield greater efficiency and improved results in the future.
- ◆ Continued use of direct mail in combination with advertising should be considered. Future programs should be designed to isolate the independent and interactive effects of direct mail and advertising on different subgroups of anglers. Insights from this research may lead to new insights and efficiencies for future programs.

Appendix A

Direct Mail Survey Questionnaire



June 27, 2005

Dear Fellow Idahoan:

You are one of a small number of people in your community we are asking for views concerning fishing and Idaho's fisheries resources. The purpose of this survey is to help us better meet your fishing-related recreational needs, and the needs of all Idahoans.

Your responses to this survey are important, so please complete all questions that apply to you. You were randomly selected for our survey, and your responses represent those of many other Idahoans in your local area. Please help us improve fishing opportunities for everyone by completing this questionnaire and returning it in the postage-paid envelope provided.

Please understand that your participation in this survey is voluntary. Be assured that your responses will be kept confidential.

We would greatly appreciate having your completed survey mailed back to us by July 31, 2006.

Sincerely,

Virgil Moore
Chief, Fisheries Division

Enter the Drawing
Win one of three Gift
Certificates by completing
and returning this survey.

We want to know how Idaho's fish and wildlife resources fit into your outdoor activities and what the Department of Fish & Game can do to make these activities more enjoyable. Everyone's opinion counts! Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

1. Which of the following outdoor activities do you regularly participate in, and of these, which do your family and friends enjoy? (Check all that apply)

Check the activities **you** do:

Is this an activity **your family and friends** enjoy?

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Camping | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hunting | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife viewing | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

2. In which of the past years have you gone fishing in Idaho? (Please check all that apply)

- 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006

3. If you haven't gone fishing yet in 2006, how likely is it that you will go fishing during 2006? (Please circle one number.)

Not at all Likely 1 - - - - - 2 - - - - - 3 - - - - - 4 - - - - - 5 Extremely Likely

Many people enjoy fishing in Idaho. We would like to know what you think about fishing in Idaho, even if you haven't gone recently.

5. How many years have you been fishing in Idaho? _____ Years

6. Please rate each of the factors listed below as to how important they are to your enjoyment of fishing?

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very Important
a. For relaxation	1	2	3	4	5
b. To be outdoors	1	2	3	4	5
c. To spend time with family or friends	1	2	3	4	5
d. To catch fish	1	2	3	4	5
e. To catch a lot of fish	1	2	3	4	5
f. To catch big fish	1	2	3	4	5
g. Convenient locations close to home	1	2	3	4	5
h. Attractive, litter-free surroundings	1	2	3	4	5
i. Not having to worry about my or others' safety ..	1	2	3	4	5
J. To have solitude	1	2	3	4	5
k. To catch native or wild fish	1	2	3	4	5
l. To keep some fish to eat	1	2	3	4	5
m. Availability of information on fishing	1	2	3	4	5
n. Nearness to camping facilities	1	2	3	4	5
o. Opportunities for activities other than fishing....	1	2	3	4	5

7. How important are each of the following in preventing you from fishing or fishing more often?

	Not at all	Somewhat	Very Important
a. Family commitments	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
b. Work commitments	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
c. Nowhere nearby to fish	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
d. No one to go fishing with	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
e. Rather spend time on other leisure activities	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
f. The price of a fishing license is too high	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
g. Others using the water interfere with fishing	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
h. Don't know <i>how</i> to fish	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
i. Don't know <i>where</i> to fish	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
j. The cost of traveling to fishing areas is too high	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
k. I have had a bad fishing experience in the past	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
l. Just not interested in fishing	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		
m. The fishing regulations are too complicated	1.....2.....3.....4.....5		

We recently conducted a public awareness campaign about fishing in your community. We would like to know if you saw or heard any of the information spots we placed.

8. During the past two months did you notice any Television, Magazine, Radio, or Newspaper advertising specifically promoting fishing? (Please check all that apply.)

- Yes, in magazines Yes, on television
 Yes, on the radio Yes, on things I received in the mail
 No, I didn't notice any of this advertising (*Please go to Question 12*)

9. Did you see fishing advertising that includes scenes of two people with one person asking to "take me fishing"?

- No (*Please go to Question 12*)
 Yes (*Continue with Question 10*)

10. Do you recall seeing or hearing about any of the following items in the past two months? (Please check all that apply.)

- Family Fishing Waters brochure mailed to your home
 "Take Me Fishing" postcard mailed to your home
 Fishing information on the Department of Fish and Game's website
 "How to" or "Where to" information in Department of Fish and Game publications
 No, I didn't hear about or see any of these (*Please go to Question 13*)

11. Did any of this fishing information influence you to buy a fishing license and go fishing? (Please check only one.)

- Yes (*Please continue with Question 12*)
 No (*Please go to Question 13*)
 I already have a 2006 fishing license (*Please continue with Question 12*)

12. Did you notice or use any of the following that may have been in items? (Please check all that apply.)

- Various license purchasing options including web site, telephone, or retailer
- Visiting the Department of Fish & Game's web site for more fishing information
- Local information on fishing locations and amenities
- Tips and ideas to make fishing easier and improve family fishing
- I did not use any of the items
- Idaho Fish and Game News
- Television stories on Idaho fishing opportunities

13. Which of the following would help you to go fishing or go fishing more often? (Please check all that apply.)

- Coupon for a lure or other item when you purchase a license from a local retailer
- Discount card for sporting goods stores with a percentage off fishing equipment
- Various license purchasing options such as web site, telephone, and retail locations
- Special information on the IDFG web site (fishandgame.idaho.gov)
- Local information on fishing locations and amenities
- Tips and ideas to make fishing easier for you and/or your family
- None of the above

We recently sent postcards, with the picture at right to remind Idahoans to get their 2006 fishing license at many local retailers, on the web, and by telephone.



14. Do you recall receiving a postcard, with the image above, that had a picture of a young girl and her father fishing?

- No, I don't recall receiving or seeing this postcard (Please skip to Question 16)
- Yes, I remember seeing this postcard

15. Did this postcard reminder influence you to buy a fishing license this year?

- No, it did not influence my decision
- Yes, it did influence my decision

16. Have you seen advertisements with the above picture in any of the following places?

- At fishing license vendors
- At Fish & Game Department offices
- On television
- In Fish & Game informational brochures
- In the Fish & Game News
- In the Fish & Game Regulation booklet
- In newspapers, magazines, publications
- I have not seen this image before

17. To thank you for completing and returning this survey, you are eligible for one of three Gift Certificates to local merchants. Please check the box below to be entered in the drawing.

- Please enter me in the drawing!** Do not enter me in the drawing.

Please provide your name, address, and email so we notify you if you win the drawing.

Name: _____ Email: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____